

Old Dominion University
ODU Digital Commons

English Faculty Publications

English

6-2003

"War if Necessary, but not Necessarily War": The Canadian Paradox and "Iraqi Freedom"

Marc A. Ouellette
Old Dominion University, mouellet@odu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english_fac_pubs



Part of the [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#), and the [International Relations Commons](#)

Original Publication Citation

Ouellette, M. A. (2003). War if necessary, but not necessarily war": The Canadian paradox and "Iraqi freedom". *Reconstruction: Studies in Contemporary Culture*, 3(3).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.



The relationship between the United States and its northern neighbor Canada has generally been seen as a symbiotic one, both economically and ideologically. Recently, with the events in the Middle East, and President George W. Bush's fixations thereof, Canada's differences have come to light as the country democratically refused to participate in the military action. Marc Ouellette, in the following article, traces the contours of this political difference -- a very different democracy -- exposing the fixations of a country with a solution for its apparent political invisibility.

"War if necessary, but not necessarily war": The Canadian Paradox and "Iraqi Freedom"

Marc Ouellette

"Geography has made us neighbors. History has made us friends. Economics has made us partners. And necessity has made us allies. Those whom nature hath so joined together, let no man put asunder."

John F. Kennedy

The View From Up Here: Introduction

<1> The Canadian refusal to join the U.S. led "coalition of the willing" does not mark the first time the nation has chosen not to follow its "traditional allies" into a foolish, ego-driven, imperialistic and vengeful conflict. Indeed, Canada's record in these matters is flawless. Peter C. Newman points out that "we went along with most presidential global adventures, except the Vietnam War. The other significant time we parted company with the Yanks was over our drive to impose economic sanctions on apartheid South Africa, a policy we initiated and successfully defended despite American objections." In fact, the objections to this policy came from the Reagan administration, which serves as the model for the current Bush regime. Despite protests from its partners, Canada managed to field the fourth largest military among the World War II Allies – the largest per capita – and did so without instituting a universal draft. At the time, Prime Minister Mackenzie King's policy was popularly known as "Conscription if necessary, but not necessarily conscription." Current Prime Minister Jean Chrétien's policy is reflected in the title of this paper, which surveys the popular and political responses – that is, what Canadians read and hear – regarding the paradoxical position.

<2> Two major ironies describe Canada's position: first, it has committed significant resources both in and around Iraq; second, despite supporting the "democratization" of Iraq, free speech has been stifled in Canada. In the latter regard, the only ones whose speech is sanctioned are those in the media and in opposition parties who oppose the Canadian government. Money motivates the anti-Canadian side. They fear economic retaliation from the United States because of Canada's unwillingness to fight. In a further irony, most of their rhetoric is anti-Canadian. The final irony is that the United States did not really want or need Canada's military support. It needs Canada to add to the credibility of its claims, but those who wanted Canada to go to war now deride the nation as insignificant. Ultimately, Canada's position on the war in Iraq not only exposes the myth of North American sameness, but interrogates the common sense of that assumption.

<3> Unlike its neighbour, Canada is a compromise [1]. This fundamental difference shapes Canadian policy at home and abroad. Despite President Bush's binaristic (and simplistic) view of the world, Canada has tried to find and occupy the middle ground. The American response, both popular and political, has not been surprising at all. Instead, the variety of Canadian responses to the government's refusal to join in "Iraqi Freedom" reveal some strange behaviours for a country the United Nations usually rates as the best place to live. The convenient approach for opponents of Canada's stance on war in Iraq has been the suggestion that the government acted unilaterally, without consulting or expressing the will of the people. This is hardly the case. A poll conducted for the *Toronto Star* and *La Presse* by EKOS Research shows that a majority of Canadians, except in Alberta, support the Prime Minister's decision to stay out of a war in Iraq. The study showed "71 per cent of those polled backed the decision by the Liberal government, with 27 per cent registering their disapproval" (Harper). Allan R. Gregg examines the findings of *Maclean's* annual poll for indications of Canadians' feelings towards the (government of the) United States. He reports that there is "a solid sentiment that the United States is acting like a bully" and a majority fear losing Canada's independence to the United States (32). The numbers indicate that more than two-thirds of Canadians feel this way and only 41% of Canadians polled support attacking Iraq despite the absence of "weapons of mass destruction" (Strategic Counsel 36). The same poll reports that the greatest change in the lives of Canadians since the "events of Sept. 11th (2001)" is that they are consuming more news. With the increase in information comes the sense that the American "view of the world is increasingly different from ours" (Gregg 34). An Ekos poll which found that "38 percent of respondents identified President Bush as the biggest threat to world peace, compared to 56 percent who chose Saddam Hussein" is more telling but not surprising (Kurth). After all, when he was Governor of Texas, Bush approved his state's execution of a foreign national, in clear violation of international laws and treaties. The man had been denied his right to consular contact. Thus, his arrest, conviction and sentence should have been voided. That man was a Canadian. That is how Bush treats allies. That is how much regard he has for the Geneva convention.

<4> Bush's obstinacy – even as mounting evidence shows his reasons for war were false – seemingly confirms Canadians' suspicions. In March, 2003, the Canadian ambassador to the United Nations, Paul Heinbecker, delivered his government's compromise proposal in effort to avoid war or obtain United Nations' support should war really become the only option in Iraq. France, Russia and Germany were amenable to the proposal; the Bush administration obstinately refused. Arthur Kent reports one Canadian diplomat's frustration: "Why do so many Americans support the Bush plan, and why are they angered by other nations' protests? It's mainly because Bush managed to link the Iraq issue to counterterrorism, and the American public is hurt by suggestions the world doesn't want to support the U.S. against terror" (qtd. in Kent, 17 March 2003 19). The prevailing view is that the United States still stings from the attacks by al-Qaeda and somebody – anybody – is going to pay. The only questions is "Who's next?" Amazingly, Bush (and Blair) now find themselves wanting to give inspectors more time to

find the mythical “weapons of mass destruction” and claiming that the weapons were destroyed before the war. In other words, the conditions for peace were met and Bush went to war anyway.

<5> Jonathon Gatehouse points out what most Canadians feel: “The problem for Donald Rumsfeld is that hardly anyone believes he’s telling the whole truth” when he suggests the war in Iraq is not about oil (18). Nearly two years after “the events of Sept. 11 (2001),” “despite the best efforts of the CIA and other intelligence services, there is still no compelling connection, direct or otherwise, between the Iraqi dictator and the attacks on New York and Washington, or terrorism at large” (Gatehouse 21). Magnus Ranstorp, deputy director of the Centre for the Study of Terror and Political Violence at St. Andrew’s University in Scotland concurs: “There is no evidence that would justify military action” (qtd. in Gatehouse 21). The majority of Canadians agree: Saddam Hussein never represented a credible threat to North America. He did not possess the means to attack the continent, nor is Canada a likely target. Nobody likes Hussein, but the U.S. has deposed and installed dictators many times in the last fifty years without going to war [2].

<6> Howard Zinn, author of *A People’s History of the United States* acknowledges the (current) American approach to diplomacy: “We’re not interested in democratic reforms. We’re interested in regimes we can control” (qtd. in Gatehouse 22). This goes for both enemies and allies. Ultimately, the governments’ behaviours resemble their postures during the Vietnam era. A recently released FBI document from 1967 criticized Canada’s “disinclination to become involved in the war in Vietnam” and the “impressive array of well meaning back seat drivers in Ottawa” (qtd. in Russo). The report, ordered by famed paranoid fascist cross-dresser Herbert Hoover accused Canada of “going unaccountably pacificist and neutralist” (qtd. in Russo). Clearly, there is never a good reason to be neutral and peace loving.

Soviet Canuckistan: Anti-Canadianism

<7> Despite Canada’s refusal to become nationally embroiled in Vietnam – and the nations leaders’ outright hatred for each other – the nations managed to get along. As far as many Americans – and certainly their leaders – are concerned, history consists of nothingness and everything since “the events of September 11” [3]. Thus it is not entirely surprising that Prime Minister Chr tien appears on one of the cards in the *Deck of Weasels* along with Tim Robbins, Susan Sarandon and other notable opponents of the war. Anti-Canadian sentiments have issued from both conservative and liberal sources in the American media and politics. Bill O’Reilly, like many conservative Americans, insists that Canada has a “very lenient immigration policy and a wide open border. [. . .] It’s the most lax immigration policy I have ever seen in any country anywhere” (qtd. in Wallin). When Canadian Consul in New York Pamela Wallin countered O’Reilly’s claims, which are rarely based on facts, he ignored her and changed the subject. Moreover, he became incensed when Wallin pointed that “the actions of successive American governments over years, their foreign policy in general, might have been provocative.” He also cut her off and went to a commercial when she pointed out the number of Canadian service people who are directly involved in the “war on terrorism” in its many facets.

<8> Former Nixon speech writer and failed Republican presidential candidate Pat Buchanan blasts on MSNBC where half a million tune in daily (Carr). He regularly calls Canada “France Light” and “Soviet Canuckistan” following the refusal to issue special identification papers, with fingerprints, for Canadians of Arab descent (qtd. in Carr). According to Buchanan, such racial and religious discrimination is necessary because Canada is a “safe haven (sic) for terrorists” (qtd. in Carr). Buchanan’s views are echoed by one of his usual targets, Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton [4]. In the latter instance, this clearly resulted from a rather cynical attempt to cash in on popular prejudices. Clinton jumped on the anti-Canada bandwagon after “the FBI posted the pictures and names of five Middle Eastern men on its Web site who it suspects entered the U.S. on or about Christmas Eve using forged documents. FBI officials cautioned that little is known about the individuals – including whether they had crossed into the U.S. from Canada (some sources said they had)” (Beltrame, 13 Jan. 2003 18). This incident, like the early reports that claimed the 11 Sept. 2001 terrorists came to the U.S. from Canada, proved to be a hoax. Fox News reported that “Canada’s immigration minister says Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton should apologize for speculating on a Canadian link to terrorism after reports that five terrorist suspects entered the United States from Canada turned out to be false” (AP, 10 Jan. 2003). She refused, saying that she finds the hoax “all too believable [. . .] I take very seriously my responsibility to speak out about the U.S. government’s responsibility to allocate increased resources to the protection of our northern border and I will continue to do so” (qtd. in AP, 10 Jan. 2003). Unfortunately for Fox News, they had to give up their anti-Canadianism for a moment to attack Ms. Rodham Clinton, revealing where the important issue rely lies.

<9> In fact, as CanWest Global’s Janice Tibbetts explains, the list of countries sending illegals to the U.S. is “topped by Mexico” and Canada ranks fifteenth. Nevertheless, “many high profile Americans, including members of Congress, have publicly complained that Canada’s lax immigration laws make it a haven for terrorists. The fear has persisted since Sept. 11, 2001, when there were reports – that later proved false – that some of the culprits had slipped into the U.S. through Canadian checkpoints.” It has been revealed that the Canadian Immigration Department “has lost track of about 36,000 failed refugee claimants in the last six years” while the U.S. has lost track of over 2 million (qtd. in Tibbetts). The U.S. population is ten times that of Canada, but there are nearly sixty times more illegal aliens and every one of the 11 Sept. 2001 hijackers entered the U.S. legally. Yet the belief that Canada houses terrorist not only persists, it has become part of American common sense.

<10> At some level, though, some negative reactions from Americans can be expected. Posturing aside, the U.S. was attacked. What is surprising is to hear their view parroted by some of Canada’s elected officials. For example, Jamie Wallace, a spokesman for Ontario Public Security Minister Bob Runciman, claims that a North American security perimeter “makes sense” (qtd. in Perkel). However, Immigration Minister Denis Coderre contends “our [current] visa policy is better than the Americans” and the new identification cards for permanent residents is “the most secure card of its kind in the world” (qtd. in Perkel). Ultimately, “Iraqi Freedom” reveals a rift not between Canada and the U.S., but among Canadians. Anti-Canadian sentiment in the U.S. tends to evoke two reactions from Canadians – anti-Americanism and anti-Canadianism. These both stem from the same source: a national inferiority complex [5]. The inferiority complex leads many Canadian, on both sides of the debate, to be slight-prone. *Maclean’s* editor Anthony Wilson-Smith laments “a segment of the Canadian population and its worshipful attitude toward all things American [. . .] those Canadians who think the U.S. is always right [. . .] they’re forever channel-hopping U.S. television and radio shows and combing American publications, seeking . . . anything, that either slights Canada, or makes an unfavourable comparison between the two countries. [. . .] You hear soliloquies to the

U.S. expressed routinely in the Canadian Alliance [and] read the same in the opinion pages of both national newspapers" (7 Apr. 2003). He adds, "Those people who love the U.S. too blindly and too much would surrender our sovereignty and stifle debate in Canada to a degree that Americans themselves would never permit. And Americans, like most people, don't find desperate neediness to be a terribly attractive quality in a friend" (7 Apr. 2003). But there have been slights, most notably the paltry punishment given two American pilots who disobeyed orders and mistakenly bombed and killed Canadians in Afghanistan [6].

<11> Regardless, anti-Canadian views have come largely from Canadian politicians and political commentators [7]. Dimitry Anastakis, a Fulbright Fellow at Michigan State University, recognizes that "The anti-Canadian party has its own newspapers, its own spokespeople, even its own party in the House of Commons. [. . .] Try as it might the [National] Post's search for a Canadian link to the 9/11 terrorist attacks did not yield any results." Stephen Harper, the leader of the Canadian Alliance Party – a largely western, rural, royalist, conservative, Christian fundamentalist group – has tried to snare extra face time by opposing the government at every turn [8]. When the Chr tien government wanted to pool military transport aircraft with the U.S., Harper complained about giving up Canadian sovereignty; when the government refused to let the Americans dictate immigration policy because it would mean a loss of sovereignty, Harper complained about losing a friend. Harper's rhetoric usually takes an anti-Canadian approach with the promise that he is the man to fix it. For example, during a trip to the U.S., he told American reporters that "Canada appears content to become a second-tier socialistic country, boasting ever more loudly about its economy and social services to mask its second-rate status" (qtd. in Anastakis). Fixing it means being more like the U.S.: an Ipsos-Reid poll shows that Alliance supporters are five times more likely to agree that Canada "should become more like the United States" than the average Canadian (qtd. in Anastakis). Wilson-Smith derides Harper, "whose contribution to the war effort last week included calling Jean Chr tien a 'coward' and Defence Minister John McCallum an 'idiot' and 'clown'" (14 Apr. 2003). What Wilson-Smith did not mention is that Harper chose to use those terms while in the U.S. on a tour of media outlets. One can only assume Harper subscribes to the notion that no Canadian is ever taken seriously in Canada until he or she makes it in the U.S. It should also be noted that Harper bravely made those statements outside of the House of Commons because he would receive a severe reprimand for using unparliamentary language. In another attack, Harper called Chr tien "gutless and juvenile" and accused him of turning his back on Canadian values and traditions (qtd. in Harper). The irony is that officially Harper is the Leader of the Loyal Opposition. The term "loyal" supposedly signifies that no matter what, the opposition remains loyal to the country.

<12> The Canadian media are no different. Other than the government-run CBC, Canadian media outlets – TV, radio, print and internet – have been centralized through "convergence" and reduced to three national sources. Each issues editorial policy, even at the local level, from a head office. One group is openly affiliated with the Alliance Party, one is pro-U.S. and pro-Israel and the third is moderate. As well, many magazines, such as *Time*, have separate Canadian runs. Thus, when an issue of *Time* appears with the headline, "Would Anyone Notice if Canada Disappeared?" hits news stands and mailboxes, it was not immediately apparent that the articles supporting the premise came from Canadian writers and editors (26 May 2003). The issue did not appear in the U.S. Moreover, the words, "Canadian Edition," are barely visible in the upper left corner of the cover. The intent is to portray the message as having come from the U.S. For many Canadians this means the message has greater authority when it suggests that Canada "is disappearing from the world stage" because it refused to become involved in an illogical war (Frank 18). Yet *Time* need not be so slippery in its approach.

<13> In an article for *Maclean's*, in which he supposedly extols the virtues of Canada, John Cruickshank, the Canadian-born Vice-President of Editorial for the *Chicago Sun-Times* claims that "Americans, to the extent that they care at all, are largely good-humoured about Canadian anxieties and delusions. But they are clear that their northern neighbours are a distinct and different people. Why then is it so difficult for Canadians to get that?" The basic premise is that difference is an always already proposition, so why worry about it. Cruickshank then spends eighteen of his twenty inches explaining why the United States is better than Canada and, without citing any specific incidents, running down Canada's foreign and domestic policies. Ultimately, Cruickshank attributes Canadian anxiety about "Americanization" to delusions of grandeur rather than an inferiority complex: "how does a nation that is one-tenth the size of another in population, with a vanishing military, an economy smaller than a couple of large U.S. states, and a dramatically different political system, imagine it is like its much more powerful neighbour?" After claiming that a nation that returned to its "America: love it or leave it" tendencies is a more egalitarian and democratic society than Canada, Cruickshank offers only one example of Canadian identity: "The country had a noble record standing up for freedom and the British Empire in the 20th century. There is much to live up to in the Canada of the past." Not only is this view reductive, it reinscribes the ethnocentrism of the Britain's imperialist past under the guise of making a "safer" present through the same war-mongering means.

Loose Lips: Censorship

<14> Admittedly, there have been anti-American statements made by Canadians and their elected officials. Fans in Montr al booed the U.S. anthem before hockey games. American sports teams on tour in Canada were booed as well. MP Carolyn Parrish was caught by a microphone saying "damn Americans. I hate those bastards." She was referring to the government rather than the populace, but the effect was the same and the words were ill-chosen. Likewise, the Prime Minister's press secretary, Fran oise Ducros uttered "What a moron" in reference to U.S. President George W. Bush (qtd. in Thorne). Stephen Thorne reports that "the American media picked up on the story, with an article appearing on the popular news Web site, The Drudge Report, and with a brief mention of the incident on the CNN talk show *Crossfire*. Conservative co-host Robert Novak blasted 'weenie Canadians' and Ducros for the alleged comment and criticized Canada's military" (Thorne). Novak suggested that "Canada should be ashamed of itself" (qtd. in Thorne). These actions have had a curious effect on free speech in Canada. While Canadians like Stephen Harper openly express anti-Canadian views, Canadians who oppose war with Iraq have been stifled. Fans in Montr al were admonished by Hall of Famer Jean Beliveau to respect the anthems. Fans in Toronto were forced to endure "God Bless America" during the seventh inning stretch at Blue Jays' games.

<15> To be fair, none of the attempts at censorship actually come from the Bush administration. The Bush regime is more direct in its approach. Linda McQuaig observes that Bush is "not a president who enjoys seeing the dissent part of democracy in action." As the BBC reported in March, Bush is so petty that "negotiations over a possible address by Bush to the European Parliament fell through when the Europeans were unable to meet White House demands that a standing ovation be guaranteed" (McQuaig). Instead of direct attacks on free speech Canadians have endured subtle strategies of censorship. Anti-

war statements have been suppressed by the contextual approach, which suggests that there is an appropriate time and place for free speech or that certain individuals, by virtue of their position, should not be allowed to express their opinions. There has also been a multi-pronged attempt to conflate support for peace with other topics, which are, in fact, mutually exclusive. To the warmongers, wanting peace means supporting Saddam, wanting the troops to die and being anti-American. For example, a Canadian sailor's spouse offers "If they had families in the military maybe they'd think twice about what they're doing" (qtd. in Tutton). Many protestors have been quick to say something to the effect of "we support the troops." The passive means of censorship have far more success than direct approaches, for the simple reasons that people are more likely to resist their free speech being squashed and nobody wants to give any help to Saddam Hussein.

<16> In the House of Commons, the Canadian Alliance Party introduced a motion in the House of Commons which called for Canada to apologize for not joining the war against Iraq. The motion was easily defeated and the Prime Minister said such a statement would put a "chill" on free speech in Canada (qtd. in AP, 9 Apr. 2003). However, Jean Chr tien warned Canadian legislators "to not say anything that would comfort Saddam Hussein" (qtd. in Olive). As well, Deputy PM John Manley admonished MPs that "they need to be very careful what the say" about the U.S. (qtd. in Olive). David Olive fears free speech is at risk in Canada. Already, "the premiers of Ontario, Alberta and B.C. have squelched U.S. criticism among their caucus colleagues by extending heartfelt support to Bush in pursuing his war aims. They each fear economic retaliation for Canada's neutrality in the Iraq war." He wonders: "If censorship is to be imposed on elected representatives whose job it is to voice opinions, where does it end." He then lists several Americans, including Tom Daschle, Robert Byrd, Charles Freeman and Loretta Filipov, who was widowed on Sept. 11 (2001), who all oppose the war. Yet, Canadians who wish to curry favour with the Americans are free to say whatever they want.

<17> Thus, Natural Resources Minister Herb Dhaliwal was accused of being anti-American for saying "I think it's really regrettable and unfortunate that he's made this decision when the whole world is crying out for peace. The world expects someone who's the president of a superpower to be a statesman. I think he's let not only Americans, but the world, down by not being a statesman" (qtd. in CP, 19 March 2003). Likewise, MP Janco Peric was criticized for questioning Bush's obsession with oil: "Of course he is [going to war for oil]. You think President Bush really cares about the Iraqi people? I don't think so" (qtd. in CP, 19 March 2003). Neither of these is critical of anything other than Bush and his policies. To paraphrase Albee, the president is not the nation. Nevertheless, the criticisms created a furor among those who would wag their tails on American laps.

<18> In one of the more publicized stances against the war, Canadian basketball star, Steve Nash, appeared at the NBA All-Star Game press session wearing a shirt emblazoned with "NO WAR: shoot for peace!" Nash believes that peace beats war any time. He elaborates: "I don't want to single out the United States, because we're not perfect in Canada either. I think war is wrong. You'd think we'd have evolved enough to the point where we'd stop shooting one another. Maybe that's just wishful thinking, but that's what I hope" (qtd. in Deacon, 10 March 2003 52). Nowhere did Nash or any of his shirts spread anti-American slogans. That did not stop critics on both sides of the border from questioning Nash's stance on a variety of fronts. Syndicated sports commentator Jim Rome, among others, questioned the propriety of the venue Nash chose. For his part, Nash remains unapologetic: "From the start, I spoke out just because I don't want to see the loss of life. People are mistaking anti-war as being unpatriotic. This has nothing to do with the fact that I'm from Canada. This is a much bigger issue" (qtd. in McCosky). San Antonio's David Robinson, a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy counters, "I get a little upset. The time for debate is really beforehand. [. . .] right now [soldiers] are out there. Support 'em. [. . .] If it's an embarrassment to them, maybe they should be in a different country, because this is America and we're supposed to [be] proud of the guys we elected and put in office" (qtd. in McCosky). Nash replies: "I'm not embarrassed by America, I'm embarrassed by humanity. More than embarrassed, I think it's really unfortunate in the year 2003 that we're still using violence as a means of conflict resolution. That's what I'm speaking out against" (qtd. in McCosky). Robinson's sudden fit of patriotism should be not be taken at face value, either. This "hero" bought out his service obligation (as did his president) and managed to avoid being recalled during either conflict with Iraq.

<19> At the same time even Bush's supporters question the way he treats his foreign policy's opponents. "There's no question that this administration has been ham-handed in dealing with our allies," says Gary Schmitt of the ultra-conservative Project for the New American Century, which was founded by White House staffers Rumsfeld, Cheney and Wolfowitz (qtd. in Kent, 24 March 2003 27). Charles Dolan, vice-chairman of the non-partisan Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy consultancy to the U.S. government, echoes these concerns: "I think the administration's messaging (sic) has been a little too belligerent and it's been counterproductive in some cases. You've got people using words like 'pygmies' to describe allies, and words like 'irrelevance' for world bodies" (qtd. in Kent, 24 March 2003 28). Bush has stated openly that countries are either with him or against him. Nevertheless, Canada continues to try to occupy what little middle ground exists. Wilson-Smith recognizes the dilemma of the situation and laments "Canadians who take a curious, masochistic delight in every slight from the U.S., and who presume, on every occasion that our views diverge, that we're wrong. If Canada-U.S. relations are at low ebb these days - and they are - one big reason is that the Bush administration doesn't much care, one way or another" (27 Jan. 2003). Wilson-Smith adds that Canada is hardly unique. The U.S. administration does not really care about its relations with any other country: "Americans view the outside world with a mix of arrogance and insecurity - the former springing from their enormous power, the latter from that day [Sept. 11 2001]. The U.S. isn't the same country it was, which helps explain why it's fallen out with so many traditional old friends. We need to better understand that - but so, for that matter, do Americans" (27 Jan 2003). Understanding requires a willingness to understand -- which no longer exists.

Blood Money: The Reason for War

<20> The only "compelling" reason any critic of Canada's refusal to go to war can give is money. Fear of American economic reprisals underlies every single one of them. Canadian Press writer Mike Pettapiece finds that "Canadian business officials are trying to get the message across that these actions have potential repercussions." Stanley Hartt, a former deputy finance minister says "Everybody is afraid that their government's policy will lead to retaliation in the consumption of products. Nobody should be more afraid than Canada. When your neighbour's house is on fire, you show up with whatever you've got, a bucket or a hose. But Prime Minister Chr tien doesn't get the point that our wealth is created because of our trade with America." I agree, and when New York and Washington were burning we sent everything we had, opened our homes and airports, and helped hunt down those who started the fires. However, if my neighbour goes to the other side of town to pick a fight

with someone I barely even know and my only reward is the hint of future financial gain, I'm not sure the analogy holds true.

<21> Canadians do have some reason for concern. Bill O'Reilly, Pat Buchanan and other pundits have called on Americans to boycott Canadian goods and they have been successful: "In a telephone survey of 1,000 Americans, Fleishman-Hillard Canada and Wirthlin Worldwide report that 48 per cent of those polled are 'very likely' or 'somewhat likely' to try an alternative to Canadian goods they have purchased in the past [and] 8 per cent of respondents have already found substitutes for Canadian products" (CP, 19 Apr. 2003). Nevertheless, Prime Minister Chr tien refused to be drawn into the war for merely economic reasons. In a speech in parliament he explained, "The decision on whether or not to send troops into battle must be a decision of principle, not a decision of economics, not even a decision of friendship alone" (qtd. in AP, 9 Apr. 2003). Canadian Chamber of Commerce official Bob Keyes: there are a "lot of very nervous people [. . .] At some point, something is going to rebound on us. There is going to be resentment" (qtd. in Pettapiece). It could be worse for Ontario: "there is more trade between Ontario and American states than between Japan and the U.S." (Pettapiece). Hamilton, Ontario, auto parts producer Jeff Caruba reports clients saying "What's wrong with your government?" (qtd. in Pettapiece). Hamilton Chamber of Commerce executive John Dolbec has received "significant expressions of disappointment" from American businesses, but he allows "Americans are the kind of people who wrap themselves around the flag (sic). And certainly, they have a lack of understanding on why Canada would want to be neutral" (qtd. in Pettapiece). The economy in Canada has not suffered. In fact, Detroit area auto parts makers turned to barges to maintain shipments in spite of shutdowns at other boarder crossings. Despite the threat, Canadians still opposed the war.

<22> Predictably, the doom and gloom forecasts came from the Alliance Party and their supporters. Alberta Premier Ralph Klein has been among the most vocal critics of the federal government's stance on Iraq. Klein fears that "Chretien's position could dampen the strong relationship that exists between the oil and natural gas industries in Alberta and the U.S." (CP). Rather than examine the situation, the normally fiercely independent Klein prefers to accede to the judgment of others: "It is my personal opinion that we should stand by our friends. If they think there is a danger, a threat to the world security and world peace then I think that I would stand by those who think that aggressive action is necessary" (qtd. in CP). Most Canadians would like evidence rather than suspicion. Former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney weighed in as well. This friend of Regan and Thatcher "believed in toadying to American presidents. It is one model of conducting bilateral business; profitable for Canada, perhaps, but hardly honourable. [. . .] Mulroney has since developed extensive personal corporate interests in America, serving eight companies there"(Siddiqi). Ontario Premier Ernie Eves echoes Klein and Mulroney. It is worth noting here that Ernie Eves had been a VP at Cr dit Suisse-First Boston and Klein receives massive support from U.S.-based oil companies. Retired Ontario Premier, Mike Harris - rumoured to be headed for a return to politics in a bid for the PM's job as leader of the Alliance Party - kept his name in the news with a *Globe and Mail* editorial in which he claimed "You're shrugging off our best and most valuable friendship." Harris then lists three ways to improve Canada's standing in the world. The first is strengthening our economic ties with the U.S. Consequently, says Harris, we should sacrifice young Canadians and make the "principled stand" of going to war with the British and Americans. Harris, et al took their cue from the American Ambassador to Canada, Paul Cellucci, who made a few threatening comments in the days leading up to the war. While their ethic of greed cannot be categorized as anti-Canadian, Harris and company hardly speak for Canadian interests. They merely back America's economic hegemony over Canada and they want Canadians to pay for it.

<23> Thankfully, Canadians remain unconvinced. Many feel that Bush is trying to obscure economic problems at home: "while 58% of Americans approve of the job he's doing, just 44% favor his handling of the economy" (Benedetto). An economic crisis rather than a military victory proved to be the deciding factor in the 1992 election. There is also a concern that Bush's chief concern for the war is access to oil. In the *Toronto Star* Reza Baraheni reports that "the U.S. was careful while invading Iraq to secure the Ministry of Oil in Baghdad and Iraq's oil wells everywhere in the country, but did nothing to protect the cultural sites, the patrimony of all humanity [. . .] President Bush should have listened to [. . .] the words of demonstrators in front of the White House before the war [which] read: 'No war for oil!' They knew very well what the war was for, because during the war the coalition army secured oil wells and even kept looters away from Iraq's oil ministry." In fact, the key issue of Bush's now-cancelled visit to Canada "was to have been energy and, short of coming here to liberate us, the next most worrisome thing that Bush might have had in mind was closer ties on the energy front. [. . .] Washington has always wanted guaranteed access to our fairly ample and easy-to-reach energy resources - oil, gas, electricity - and it largely won this with the North American Free Trade Agreement. NAFTA prevents us from selling our energy resources in Canada at lower rates than we sell it in the U.S." (McQuaig). It also prevents us from cutting the amount of energy sold to the U.S. and keeping a larger share in reserve, things a sovereign nation might want to do. Only one of the five major oil companies in Canada is Canadian-owned. The Alberta government is also an American patsy. Alberta is Canada's largest oil-producing and exporting province. Virtually all of that oil goes to the U.S. and three out of the five major oil companies in Alberta are American-owned. As well, Alberta resents eastern and central Canada, which tend to be more liberal and which hold the majority of seats in parliament. Alberta still stings from the National Energy Policy, a plan to spread the wealth and to ensure Canadians a supply of energy. Many Albertans feel it was bad deal that was imposed on the province by the federal government; one which removes control from Alberta and which benefits other provinces. Ironically, controlling Canadian -- and by extension, Alberta's -- oil reserves has become a key feature of the Bush regime's National Energy Policy. However, since the lobbies are based in Canada the move towards giving up the keys to the store seemingly come from within rather than from without. Paul Rogers, a peace studies professor at the University of Bradford surmises, "The bottom line essentially is that this is not about short-term profit from oil reserves, but long-term control of what is really the world's absolute key energy source" (qtd. in Kent, 31 March 2003 28). Thus, the U.S. really fears than an independently minded Canada might not give up its energy reserves cheaply and invading Canada is not a viable option.

<24> The childish logic of those who support war with Iraq - we scratch your back, you scratch ours - hardly holds water - or oil - under scrutiny. James Travers reminds Canadians: "History and experience sever any link between Canadian compliance and American generosity. [. . .] Who in the U.S. now remembers Ken Taylor's heroics rescuing Americans from Iran and the Ayatollah? [. . .] Rich contracts didn't flow from the broad effort to free Kuwait [and] four friendly-fire deaths [in Afghanistan] didn't change punitive U.S. policy on softwood lumber imports" (27 March 2003). Any trade war would hurt the already teetering U.S. economy, as well. Mary Janigan cites statistics which show that "Canada buys 19 per cent of U.S. exports: it is the largest market for 38 states. And it supplies 17 per cent of U.S. imports of crude and refined oil products and 94 per cent of natural gas imports." Trade Minister Pierre Pettigrew acknowledges: "We do not realize the U.S. is dependent on us as well" (qtd. in Janigan). Doron Levin of Bloomberg News warns "a consumer boycott could have the

unintended effect of sparking a trade battle that wouldn't benefit either side." In fact, Joel Kurth of the *Detroit News* reports businesses in Detroit have already been hurt because Canadians have been discouraged by unnecessary hassles at the border.

<25> The U.S. also risks retaliation from Europe. For example, in a poll conducted by Washington's Pew Research Center, "Only 14 per cent of Spaniards and 34 per cent of Italians view the U.S. positively" (qtd. in Kent, 31 March 2003 30). The latter figure is half of the rating just a year ago. Even so, those in Alberta's oil patch may not see the windfall they think merits a war. Vincent Lauerman, a global energy analyst with the Canadian Energy Research Institute in Calgary acknowledges that Canadian energy produces stand to lose if the U.S. takes control of Iraq's oil reserves. He says, "If prices dip too low, high-cost oil fields like those in Canada, the U.S. and Europe are no longer profitable, production tumbles and the world becomes more, not less, dependent on Mideast crude" (qtd. in Gatehouse 18). Economic retribution was never a serious option. It was merely a threat. In a speech in Toronto shortly after the fall of Baghdad, the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Thomas Donohue "soothed the fears of business people [. . .] by saying Canada was still America's trusted trading partner even though it declined to join the war" (Deacon, 14 Apr. 2003 28). The previously bilious Paul Cellucci was similarly conciliatory: "We are friends, we are neighbours, and we are family, and nothing is ever going to change that" (qtd. in Deacon, 14 Apr. 2003 28). Donald Coxe, chairman of the Harris Investment Management group in Chicago, sees dollar signs for Canada in any case: "The oil belongs to the Iraqi people, but the companies that develop it will get acceptable investment returns." He claims the U.S. seriously lacks the workforce necessary to exploit Iraq's oil reserves if it hopes to supplant the French and Russian workers. Thus, while Canada may not directly benefit from the war-windfall, some individual Canadians may; while the oil industry may not benefit, oil workers might. This duality, then, mirrors the predominant Canadian stance on the war.

"Know your role": Canada's War Effort

<26> Canada was and still is involved in the war in Iraq. This is an official government policy. It is also an official government policy to stay out of the war in Iraq. Although Canada's Foreign Minister, Bill Graham, denies it, Canada has contributed to the war in Iraq by taking over important roles elsewhere in the region. For example, more than 1,500 Canadian troops were sent to join those already in Afghanistan so that American forces could be freed to fight in Iraq. This brings the total number of Canadian forces involved to roughly 4,000, or double the forces committed by Australia. Graham claims, "It wasn't a deal or anything else. U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld raised the problem earlier and there's no question that Canada's decision to step in to fill this military gap is an important contribution [. . .] because we're satisfying an important peacekeeping mission and we're doing something we're uniquely qualified to do" (33). Graham calls Canada's mission in Afghanistan peace-keeping but admits "This is not a mission without risk. [. . .] This is a mission in which the skills of our soldiers will be called upon in many ways. Not just in being excellent people who don't shy away from a fight" (33). The strategy is to "shade our contribution" in order to counter public ambivalence to the war (Gatehouse 19). After all, Canada provided nearly 2,000 field troops in Afghanistan when many other nations refused. In February, "Canada took command of the multinational naval group, known as Task Force 151, patrolling the Persian Gulf region. [. . .] In addition to the 30 Canadian Forces personnel working at the U.S. Central Command in Qatar, there are 150 Canadian troops on exchange with U.S. and British forces in the area who could see action" (Beltrame, 31 March 2003 36). The location of JTF2, Canada's elite commando unit, has remained a secret since they redeployed from Afghanistan. From Iraq, Robert Sheppard reports that in "Canada's case, about 30 officers are providing logistical support in the air and on the ground, apparently not far from Baghdad." Similarly, Germany, which opposes the war, provides "the bulk" of NATO's AWACS patrols over Turkey and northern Iraq (Sheppard).

<27> Canadians were more frustrated by the government's prolonged fence-sitting than by its anti-war stance. Wilson-Smith summarizes the view: "Do we go boldly to war if the U.S. and the British do so without UN support, or declare, as boldly, that we assert our right to stay at home? Either would be preferable to the present indecision in Ottawa – which, unresolved, becomes a decision by default, and makes us wannabe spectators to a contest that ultimately has no sidelines" (27 Jan. 2003). Ambassador Cellucci contends, "They support the global war on terror, but they're not supporting us fully" (qtd. in AP, 25 March 2003). The normally hawkish Stephen Harper has protested against Canada's role, asking "Will the government admit that it has already agreed to contribute to military actions in Iraq through back channels?" (qtd. in Tutton). Harper's political polar opposite, Jack Layton, the leader of the leftist (and socialist) NDP was equally miffed by Chr tien's stance. Layton expresses confusion though he supports staying out of the war: "Deciding at the absolute last possible moment, with 3,000 troops or so already in the theatre, sent a lot of mixed messages. I don't think it cultivated any sense of respect" (qtd. in Frank 18). Here, the leader of the fourth-place party invokes the inferiority complex from the anti-war stance. What goes unacknowledged is that Canada waited "until the last minute" as a signal that it was committed to peace and to the United Nations. In this regard, Chr tien pledged resources and funds for the reconstruction of Iraq from the get go.

Where Is Here?: Conclusions

<28> Prime Minister Chr tien reminds critics that "We would have preferred to be able to agree with our friends, but we have an independent country, make our own decisions based on our own principles" (qtd. in AP, 9 Apr. 2003). Agree or not, we were all told to "support the troops." Well, like it or not, support democracy. The truth is, a *USA Today* poll showed that most Americans felt the same way as most Canadians: "54% favor a U.S. invasion," but without a U.N. vote, "support for a war drops to 47%" (Benedetto). That's why the U.S. government has been so harsh in its criticism of its allies: "Americans always believe it is always better to have as much allied support as you can get before going to war," says Merle Black, a political scientist at Atlanta's Emory University (qtd. in Benedetto). The U.S. was not worried about Canada's military support, but rather Canada's credibility in the United Nations. Canadian support would have helped legitimize Bush's extravagant, paranoid, claims. Mark Rozell, of Catholic University of America, in Washington, D.C., calls Americans' response to war "the classic rallying-around-the-flag. They may be uneasy about going to war, but they feel that criticizing now would be unpatriotic" (qtd. in Benedetto).

<29> Ultimately, as Peter C. Newman points out, "the Chr tien government was the first to propose the UN compromise resolution for a cooling-off period, which later was borrowed (without credit) by Tony Blair, and even briefly won reluctant approval of Chirac." In other words, the Canadian position was a good enough compromise for Britain and France to agree. The

Americans’ listening was only a charade designed to last long enough for the necessary troops to be in place; nothing was ever going to stop Bush from invading some place. John H. Thompson, director of Canadian Studies concurs: “if there is a problem in [the] Canada-U.S. relationship it’s that the Bush administration has a unilateralist bent and isn’t out to be nice to anyone. [. . .] They really don’t care” (qtd. in Ward). Canada’s support “matters a lot” says Charles Doran, who teaches Canadian-American relations at Johns Hopkins University. “And if Canada takes an earlier position it matters a lot more than if – at the last moment – it says, well, we’ll join everybody else” (qtd. in Cheadle, 2 Feb. 2003). David Lightburn, director of external affairs at the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre agrees: “Canada plays a special role in bridging between U.S. views on issues and a European consensus. Many European nations look to us to try to understand the States sometimes. That means we can’t be as black-and-white on issues and jump into bed” with either side (qtd. in Cheadle, 2 Feb. 2003).

<30> One of the things that ensures Canada-U.S. relations will be relatively harmonious is America’s insatiable need for commodities. Moreover, the government’s economic policy assumes that it is Americans’ God-given right to have unfettered access to any and all commodities at the lowest possible prices – even if American industries suffer and disappear as a result. Thus, as Donald Coxe points out, the Bush regime’s punitive duties on Canadian products actually backfire: “The real culprits are big American pension plans and a few wealthy families, not Canadian provinces. [. . .] Because these financial giants control the supply of timber, the hard-pressed paper and forest companies, loggers and mills have to pay what amount to monopoly prices.” This is just one example! Paul Cellucci has crisscrossed Canada to see for himself the resources his elected masters in Washington want to exploit: “I know the resources are vast. And part of what the President’s national energy policy is about is a complete integration of [the] North American energy market. We have to have reliable transmission of energy in North America, so we’re not dependent on Venezuela and the Middle East” (qtd. in McCarthy). Alberta’s oil fields, for example “contain 180 billion barrels, [. . .] more than the 112 billion barrels of proven reserves in Iraq [. . .] so, even as the tempest over Iraq raged, Mr. Cellucci was pitching for action to improve the flow of energy from north to south” (McCarthy).

<31> War will and should bring out the strongest views and it will always depend on where you live and your pre-existing biases. *Maclean’s* editor Wilson-Smith questions why “it’s considered accurate and OK for the American media to emphasize the dominant American effort in the war – but inaccurate and unfair from anti-war countries to do the same. [. . .] There’s a school of thought to the effect that there’s no such thing as objectivity in journalism: everyone has a point of view, and perhaps the most honest thing is to acknowledge that up front” (21 Apr. 2003). Ultimately, he fears that the real danger of the U.S. media’s ratings-motivated war cheerleading, especially CNN and Fox News, is that you never have a chance of knowing why the other side(s) feels the way they do. James Travers echoes the concerns: “The implications are profound. There is the confluence of uncontested military dominance and the reinforcement of a supportive media colossus. From it flows a torrent of positive images about liberation, freedom and democracy that makes it difficult for Americans to grasp why others fear and resist invasion, foreign rule and the replacement of one regime with another” (19 Apr. 2003).

<32> Former Canadian Ambassador to the U.S. Allan Gotlieb claims that a nation’s foreign policy needs to be in the best interests of its citizens and that “The national interest needs, of course, to be understood in the widest sense. It embraces the economic prosperity and physical security of its people, the defense and promotion of its core values, the pursuit of a just and stable world” (42). That said, “The highest priority in Canadian foreign policy should be to enhance our economic security in our relationship with the United States” (43). He concludes that “If Canada genuinely wants to contribute to peace and international security, if it wants to affect outcomes in the world, then it must be able to influence the U.S.” (43). Sorry, Mr. Gotlieb, but that situation already exists. We tried. The U.S. is not listening. It’s not that we don’t have a big enough economy or military. The EEC is comparable to the U.S. and has nuclear capable members. Former Noranda Chairman and CEO Adam Zimmerman agrees: “Americans, as individuals are fine, wonderful, generous people [. . .] But collectively, their national game is hardball – and winning is everything. Thus, notwithstanding the North American Free Trade Agreement, Canada is punished by the U.S. in trade in lumber, steel, wheat and fish, to name the big ones, because the Americans won’t accept our rules.” Zimmerman continues: “Those people to whom trade, growth and profit count most make the point that economic reprisals are inevitable. Yes, economic security is vitally important, but the reverse is also true: perhaps we should put a value on what we mean to the U.S. Our power, hydrocarbons, auto-parts manufacturing and materials like lumber, steel, newsprint and aluminium are as vital to the U.S. economy as their market is to ours.” He concludes: “As for influencing Washington, we do so best if we stand firmly behind our interests and beliefs. [. . .] It isn’t worth adjusting our beliefs in the naive notion that we really will influence the U.S. – against its will.” Nor should we be turned into toadies against ours.

Notes

[1] Following attempts at deportation and assimilation, the British allowed the French descendants in what was then Upper Canada (today’s QuÉbec) to keep their language, religion and customs. This compromise was entrenched in confederation, in 1867, and in the repatriated constitution of 1982. Despite the recent fall of separatists, tensions still exist between anglo- and francophone Canadians and play out in subtle ways. For example, the most conservative newspapers – the *National Post* and the *Sun* papers, especially – typically omit the accented first “È” in ChrÉtien. [\[^\]](#)

[2] Bush should know this well since his father – as CIA director, Vice-President and President – participated in many such actions involving “extreme prejudice.” [\[^\]](#)

[3] Despite the well-documented efforts of Hollywood (through the *Rambo*, *Missing in Action*, and *Iron Eagle* series and similar action movies) and the “victories” in the Cold and (First) Gulf Wars, Vietnam guilt still stings many in the U.S. The popular suggestion leading up to and during the current war has been that those who dispute the need for war are somehow against the troops. This reveals the lingering guilt caused by the abuse hurled at Vietnam veterans during contemporaneous protests. I refuse to conflate anti-war sentiment and feelings for the combatants – on either side. First, U.S. troops today are all volunteers. Second, I concur with those who maintain that by paying taxes I have supported troops. Third, I cannot imagine any greater “support for the troops” than wanting peace so that everyone comes home safely. Even military think-tank Global Security reminds visitors to its website of Robert E. Lee’s sage advice: “It is good that war is so horrible, lest we grow too fond of it.” [\[^\]](#)

[4] If anyone doubts Rodham Clinton's motive is image change, let me point out that conservative news outlet NewsMax has added a *Deck of Hillary* to its line of cards – which already includes the *Iraq's Most Wanted* and *Deck of Weasels* cards – picturing America's enemies. [^]

[5] Canada's national inferiority complex is well-documented elsewhere. Basically, the perception is that Canadian products and people are inferior unless accepted in the U.S. David Rudd, executive director of the Canadian Institute for Strategic Studies observes, "Canadians have a national inferiority complex that craves U.S. recognition" (qtd. in Cheadle). This inferiority complex was stung when Pres. Bush failed to acknowledge Canada's efforts in his speech thanking allies for help on and immediately after 11 Sept. (2001) and again following the "shoot first, ask questions later" attack by American pilots on Canadian troops in Afghanistan. Rudd cautions: "We cannot derive our self-worth by pats on the head" (qtd. in Cheadle). [^]

[6] Moreover, the U.S. government has decided that the wrongful death suit will be held in Afghanistan. ABC News correspondent Andrew Chang reports that "The United States has a curiously varied record on the values it assigns to the lives of its victims. In the last decade, victims' families have been compensated with as little as \$200 for a lost loved one – and as much as \$2 million." In the case of Afghan victims, the U.S. offered between \$200 and \$1000 per victim. Marc Herrold, a professor at the University of New Haven who studies such cases concludes "The amounts paid to the Afghans are paltry and insulting, even far below what should be given using the discounted future earnings approach" (qtd. in Chang). Herrold concludes that the only thing that matters in such cases is "Clout" with the American regime (qtd. in Chang). [^]

[7] *Maclean's* looked for anti-Canadianism in the U.S. In Burlington, VT, Benoit Aubin reports "we heard not a peep of resentment, scorn or, God forbid, hostility, while talking to war veterans and peace activist, scholars, even the mother of a U.S. Marine killed in Iraq five days before" (32). Despite the efforts of talk radio, Vermont's citizens feel "More hurt than angry" with Canada (qtd. in Aubin 32). Other boarder regions appear similarly ambivalent. [^]

[8] The previous Alliance leader, Stockwell Day, now the External Affairs Critic, is himself an ordained fundamentalist preacher. His predecessor, Preston Manning, is the son of western Canada's most popular radio evangelist who also happened to be Premier of Alberta. Preston's physical and political resemblance to his father earned him the nickname "Parson Manning." In short, the Alliance Party makes Bush seem secular. [^]

[9] In 1979, as Iranian revolutionaries were taking Americans hostage at the U.S. embassy in Tehran, Canadian Ambassador to Iran, Ken Taylor, managed to smuggle several Americans to safety. He was hailed as a hero following his return to North America but has been largely forgotten. His fleeting fame was a topic of a satiric skit by Canadian comedy icon SCTV. [^]

Works Cited

Anastakis, Dimitry. "Anti-American? What about anti-Canadianism." *Toronto Star* 27 March 2003: A31.

Associated Press. "Canada Is Tired of Taking Blame for Terrorist Threat to U.S." *FOXNews.com*. Online. 10 Jan. 2003. Internet. 15 Apr. 2003. Available www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,75153.html.

---. "Canada Worried About 'Bump in Relations' With U.S." *Fox News Channel*. Online. 25 March 2003. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available www.foxnews.com.

---. "Chr tien defends stance on Iraq war." *USA Today*. Online. 9 Apr. 2003. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2003-04-09-war-canada_x.htm.

Aubin, Benoit. "'More hurt than angry.'" *Maclean's* 21 Apr. 2003: 32-4.

Beltrame, Julian. "New Fears for the New Year." *Maclean's* 13 Jan. 2003: 18-20.

---. "Washington is Watching." *Maclean's* 31 March 2003: 36-7.

Canadian Press. "Klein slams Chretien over Canada's position on Iraq." *Canoe*. Online. 17 March 2003. Internet. 21 Apr. 2003. Available www.canoe.ca/CNEWS/Politics/2003/03/17/45609-cp.html.

---. "48% in U.S. would choose non-Canadian products: Poll." *Toronto Star*. Online. 18 Apr. 2003. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available www.thestar.com.

---. "U.S. attitude to Canadian goods shifts, poll finds." *Toronto Star*. Online. 19 Apr. 2003. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available www.thestar.com.

---. "Chretien defends stance on Iraq." *Canoe*. Online. 19 March 2003. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available www.canoe.ca/CNEWS/Canada/2003/17/45035-cp.html.

---. "Government asks military to draw up list of options for Iraq." *Canoe*. Online. 22 Apr. 2003. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available www.canoe.ca/NationalTicker/CANOE-wire.Iraq-Canada.html.

Carr, Nancy. "U.S. talk-show host Pat Buchanan call Canada 'whining,' 'freeloading' nation." *Canoe*. Online. 1 Nov. 2002. Internet. 15 Apr. 2003. Available <http://cnews.canoe.ca/>

CNEWS/Canada/2002/10/31/3057.html.

Chang, Andrew. "What Price Life? It Depends on Who You Are, and What Your Country's Worth." *ABCNEWS.com*. Online. 4 Sept. 2002. Internet. 19 Apr. 2003. Available www.abcnews.com.

Cheadle, Bruce. "Chretien irks both hawks and doves." *Canoe*. Online. 2 Feb. 2003. Internet 15 Apr. 2003. Available <http://cnews.canoe.ca/CNEWS/Canada/2003/02/02/19649-cp.html>.

---. "Bush apology too late for some." *Canoe*. Online. 19 Apr. 2002. Internet. 15 Apr. 2003. Available http://www.canoe.ca/CNEWSAttack0204/19_bush-cp.html.

Coxe, Donald. "Canada's Opportunity." *Maclean's* 31 March 2003: 44.

Cruikshank, John. "We're not like Americans." *Maclean's*. 30 Dec. 2002: 39.

Deacon, James. "Maverick Nash." *Maclean's* 10 March 2003: 48-52.

---. "After Baghdad." *Maclean's* 14 Apr. 2003: 26-8.

Frank, Steven. "Where has Canada gone?" *Time* 26 May 2003: 14-8.

Gatehouse, Jonathon. "The New New World Order." *Maclean's* 27 Jan. 2003: 16-22.

Graham, Bill. Interview with Tom Fennell. *Maclean's* 10 March 2003: 32-3.

Gregg, Allan R. "Strains Across the Border." *Maclean's* 30 Dec. 2002: 32-36.

Harper, Tim. "Canadians back Chretien (sic) on war, poll finds." *Toronto Star*. Online. 22 March 2003. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available www.thestar.com.

Hartt, Stanley. Interview with Katherine Macklem. *Maclean's* 31 March 2003: 30.

Janigan, Mary. "Trouble at the Border." *Maclean's* 31 March 2003: 34.

Kent, Arthur. "War - at any cost?" *Maclean's* 17 March 2003: 18-20.

---. "No turning back?" *Maclean's* 24 March 2003: 26-30.

---. "Changing the Global Rules." *Maclean's* 31 March 2003: 28-30.

Kurth, Joel. "War cools relations between U.S., Canada." *Detroit News*. Online. 23 March 2003. Internet. 23 March 2003. Available www.detnews.com/2003/metro/0303/23/a09-116135.htm.

Levin, Doron. "Boycotting German cars may spark trade fight that hurts U.S., too." *Detroit News*. Online. 15 Apr. 2003. Internet. 15 Apr. 2003. Available www.detnews.com/2003/insiders/0304/15/insider-137206.html.

McCarthy, Shawn. "Forgive, forget." *Globe and Mail*. Online. 18 Apr. 2003. Internet. 18 Apr. 2003. Available www.globeandmail.com.

McCosky, Chris. "Nash, Admiral have war of words on Iraq." *Detroit News*. Online. 23 March 2003. Internet. 23 March 2003. Available www.detnews.com/2003/pistons/0303/23/c05-116258.htm.

McQuaig, Linda. "U.S. wants to liberate our energy." *Toronto Star*. Online. 20 Apr. 2003. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available www.thestar.com.

Newman, Peter C. "What's going on here?" *Maclean's* 31 March 2003: 49.

Olive, David. "Time to stifle idiotic outbursts." *Toronto Star* 25 March 2003: A11.

O'Reilly, Bill. "Canada's Dangerous Game." *The O'Reilly Factor*. Online. 17 Apr. 2003. Internet. 17 Apr. 2003. Available www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,84420,00.html.

Perkel, Colin. "Coderre rejects security perimeter." *Canoe* (CP). Online. 7 March 2003. Internet. 20 Apr. 2003. Available <http://cnews.canoe.ca/CNEWS/Canada/2003/03/07/38568-cp.html>.

Pettapiece, Mike. "Businesses feel sting of Canada's decision not to support U.S. war in Iraq." *Calgary Sun* (CP). Online. 31 March 2003. Internet. 21 Apr. 2003. Available www.calgarysun.com/cgi-bin/printable.cgi?article=72853.html.

Russo, Robert. "FBI rips Canada's military in 1967 report." *Canoe*. Online. 9 March 2003. Internet. 21 Apr. 2003. Available <http://cnews.canoe.ca/CNEWS/World/2003/03/09/39930-cp.html>.

Sheppard, Robert. "Strange Bedfellows on the Road to Baghdad." *Maclean's* 7 Apr. 2003: 24.

Siddiqui, Haroon. "Mulroney's charge that PM is not a leader is the standard response of leaders who have had to depart in disgrace." *Toronto Star* 27 March 2003: A31.

The Strategic Counsel. "19th annual *Maclean's* year-end poll." *Maclean's* 30 Dec. 2002: 35-6.

Thorne, Stephen. "Opposition wants Chretien aide's head over reports she called Bush 'a moron.'" *Canoe*. Online. 21 Nov. 2002. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available <http://cnews.canoe.ca/CNEWS/Canada/2002/11/21/5200-cp.html>.

Tibbetts, Janice. "Our border 'not a conduit for terrorists.'" *Canada.com*. Online. 22 Apr. 2003. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available www.canada.com.

Travers, James. "U.S. envoy doesn't get it: This country will not be bullied or bribed into doing something that is morally offensive." *Toronto Star* 27 March 2003: A31.

---. "War magnifies Canada-U.S. differences." *Toronto Star*. Online. 19 Apr. 2003. Internet. 22 Apr. 2003. Available www.thestar.com.

Tutton, Michael. "Canadian destroyer leaves for Persian Gulf amid threat of war in Gulf." *Canoe*. Online. 24 Feb. 2003. Internet. 17 Apr. 2003. Available <http://cnews.canoe.ca/CNEWS/Canada/2003/02/24/31705-cp.html>.

Wallin, Pamela. Interview with Bill O'Reilly. *The O'Reilly Factor*. Fox News Channel. 3 Feb. 2003.

Ward, John. "Little changes in Canada-U.S. relations." *Canoe*. Online. 4 Sept. 2002. Internet. 15 Apr. 2003. Available <http://cnews.canoe.ca/CNEWSSept11/relations-cp.html>.

Wilson-Smith, Anthony. "Consequences of War." *Maclean's* 27 Jan. 2003: 4.

---. "Bordering on Anger." *Maclean's* 10 March 2003: 4.

---. "A Fine Balance, Please." *Maclean's* 7 Apr. 2003: 4.

---. "Reason Beats Passion." *Maclean's* 14 Apr. 2003: 4.

---. "The Media, Unbound." *Maclean's* 21 Apr. 2003: 4.

Zimmerman, Adam. "Why the PM is right." *Maclean's* 14 Apr. 2003: 32.